

Remarks

Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 5,869,819 (Knowles). The section 102 rejection means that the Examiner is asserting that Knowles discloses *every single* claim limitation – either expressly or inherently. This assertion is clearly incorrect and undermines the rejection.

Claim 1 requires a system that applies postage and a network address to the postage field on an object. In the Applicant's last amendment, Applicant clearly demonstrated that Knowles does not teach the placement of a network address in the postage field of an object. The final Office Action does not state where Knowles expressly teaches this missing limitation. Instead the final Office Action states the following.

“In Fig. 13B, Knowles discloses in elements 55(B-C), which one skilled in the art at the time would know that when dealing with parcels or packages that postage is located or incorporated into the URL/barcode, or a designated field.”

Elements 55(B-C) of Fig. 13B are a “package identification number field” and a “shipper identification field”. A package ID and a shipper ID are NOT postage, so this citation is silent on postage. In addition, the data structure of 13B exists in an Internet server and *is not even applied to the package*. (See Knowles column 19, lines 8-30, and column 19, line 66 to column 20, line 37). Thus, the final Office Action has still failed to show where Knowles expressly discloses the placement of a network address in the postage field.

Knowles cannot inherently teach this limitation since there are numerous places on a package to place the bar-encoded URL instead of the postage field. *The recent office action is merely using “one skilled in the art” to supply limitations that are clearly missing from Knowles, and this tactic is totally improper for a 102 rejection, because the single prior art reference must disclose every limitation.*

In the recent amendment, Applicant noted several other claim limitations that are missing from Knowles:

- The use of the network address to obtain information by the user who receives delivery of the object.
- The application of postage based on weight information
- The generation of a postmark that includes a network address.

The final Office Action did not state where these limitations are disclosed in Knowles.

Applicants submit that there are numerous additional reasons in support of patentability, but that such reasons are moot in light of the above remarks and are omitted in the interests of brevity. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1-20.

  
**SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER**

Michael J. Setter, Reg. No. 37,936  
Setter Ollila LLC

**CUSTOMER NO.**

**022879**

Jeff D. Limon  
**HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY**  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P. O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400  
TEL.: 541-715-5979  
FAX: 541-715-8581